1 2

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

MARYLAND SHALL ISSUE, INC., et al.,)	
Plaintiffs,)	Case No. 8:21-cv-01736-TDC (L)
v.)	
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD.,)	Case No. 8:22-cv-01967-DLB
Defendant.)	

PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES

Plaintiffs respectfully submit this notice of supplemental authorities for the purpose of bringing to the Court's attention the recent decision of the district court in *Siegel v. Platkin*, No. 22-7464 (D. N.J. Jan. 30, 2023), which was decided after briefing was complete on plaintiffs' Emergency Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and Emergency Motion for a Preliminary Injunction. In that case, the district court granted a TRO and enjoined a New Jersey from enforcing a law that was enacted in response to *NYSR&P v. Bruen*, 142 S.Ct. 2111 (2022), and imposed new restrictions on the right to carry in public recognized in *Bruen*. Specifically, the court found that at least one of the plaintiffs there had standing and enjoined New Jersey bans on the carrying of firearms in parks, beaches, recreational facilities, public libraries, museums, bars, restaurants, and where alcohol is served, entertainment facilities, in vehicles and on private property without the prior permission of the owner. In each instance, the court found that "the Second Amendment's plain text covers the conduct in question (carrying a concealed handgun for self-defense in public)." Slip op. at 23, 29, 30, 31, 32, 46.

Case 8:21-cv-01736-TDC Document 69 Filed 01/30/23 Page 2 of 3

1 In particular, the court rejected New Jersey's argument and that of its amicus that there 2 was no right to carry on private property. The Court ruled that, under *Bruen*, the right extends 3 outside the home and the right is "one's right to "wear, bear, or carry . . . upon the person or in 4 the clothing or in a pocket, for the purpose . . . of being armed and ready for offensive or defensive 5 action in a case of conflict with another person." Slip op. at 38, quoting Bruen, 142 S. Ct. at 6 7 2134. This right, the court held, "naturally encompasses one's right to public carry on another's 8 property, unless the owner says otherwise." Id. That result, the court stressed was consistent with American tradition, ruling that "Defendants' position has no basis in this country's history and 10 tradition of firearms regulation." Id. at 40. The court found that the New Jersey defendants "are, 11 'in essence, criminalizing the conduct that the *Bruen* Court articulated as a core civil right.'" Id. 12 13 In so holding, the court examined and rejected the same arguments advanced by the County and 14 by the amicus in this case, including rejecting the same historical analogues cited by the County 15

Indeed, the bans imposed by the County at issue in this case are even more restrictive and

severe than those imposed by the New Jersey law at issue in Siegel. For example, New Jersey

and Everytown here. The court's analysis is compelling and directly on point.

did not purport to impose 100-yard exclusions zones. Rather, the New Jersey law "is only

appliable in buildings or the part(s) of a building that have a restricted use, and thus, are a

"sensitive place" when used as such." Slip op. at 43. And, unlike the County, New Jersey

expressly disavowed a broad definition of "schools" that the County has expressly enacted. Id.

at 42-43. The district court also found irreparable harm, noting that "[e]ven if constitutional

deprivations are not per se irreparable injuries, the threat of prosecution for engaging in

constitutionally protected conduct certainly is." Id. at 44. Finally, the court found that the balance

27

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28

Case 8:21-cv-01736-TDC Document 69 Filed 01/30/23 Page 3 of 3

1	of the equities favored plaintiffs and that the public interest was served by preliminary relief. A		
2	copy of the district court's slip opinion is attached for the convenience of the Court.		
3	Respectfully submitted,		
4	/s/ Mark W. Pennak		
5	/s/ Mark w. Fennak		
6	MARK W. PENNAK MARYLAND SHALL ISSUE, INC.		
7	9613 Harford Rd., Ste C #1015 Baltimore, MD 21234-21502		
8	mpennak@marylandshallissue.org		
9	Phone: (301) 873-3671 District Court Bar No. 21033		
10			
11			
12			
13 14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	3		